

Appln. No. 09/739,950

Attorney Docket No. 10541-1960

II. Remarks

Claims 1 through 5 stand rejected. Claims 1 through 5 are being amended. Accordingly, after entering this amendment, claims 1 through 5 remain pending.

Reconsideration and re-examination of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1 through 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent No. 61-295494 to Hoshino et al. (Hoshino) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,078,207 to Asano et al. (Asano).

Hoshino discusses turbulators with louvers spaced along a base of a strip and extending in a direction generally *perpendicular* to a longitudinal axis of the strip. That is, fluid flowing through Hoshino's turbulators flows through the louvers in the direction generally *perpendicular* to the longitudinal axis of the strip. Claims 1 through 5, on the other hand, require louvers that direct fluid to flow through the turbulators *parallel* to a longitudinal axis of a strip along which the louvers are spaced.

Accordingly, Hoshino teaches away from Applicants' invention and therefore neither teaches nor suggests a turbulator with a plurality of louvers spaced along a base of a strip and extending in a direction generally parallel to a longitudinal axis of the strip to direct fluid through the turbulator in the direction generally parallel to the longitudinal axis, as required by amended claims 1 through 5.

As for Asano, that reference also discusses turbulators with louvers spaced along a base of a strip and extending in a direction generally *perpendicular* to a longitudinal axis of the strip. Therefore, Asano does not cure the deficiencies of



Appln. No. 09/739,950

Attorney Docket No. 10541-1960

Hoshino. As such, both Hoshino and Asano teach away from a turbulator with the features recited in amended claims 1 through 5.

Since Applicants' invention as recited in amended claims 1 through 5 is patentably distinguishable over Hoshino alone, or over Hoshino in combination with Asano, reconsideration of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and allowance of claims 1 through 5 are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present form of the claims (claims 1 through 5) are patentably distinguishable over the art of record and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted by,



John M. Card
Reg. No.: 48,423
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Dated: June 25, 2004

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610
(734) 302-6000